

New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, New York, Inc., 100 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (Incorporated in New York.)

Subscription Rates:—In Advance, Postage Paid, 60 cents per month, 5 dollars per year. Single Copies, 5 cents.

Advertising Rates:—Daily, 10 cents per line; Sunday, 15 cents per line; Special Rates, on application.

Foreign Rates:—Daily, 10 cents per line; Sunday, 15 cents per line; Special Rates, on application.

Canada Rates:—Daily, 10 cents per line; Sunday, 15 cents per line; Special Rates, on application.

You can get the merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—no risk of dissatisfaction results in any case. THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Our Neighbor, Patriot.

From the editorial columns of "The World" of Wednesday we take the following:

"All the Roosevelt and 'Staats-Zeitungen' and New York Tribunes of that time turned their mud-batteries upon him."

The reference is to the neutrality policy of George Washington, Mr. Wilson's predecessor, as "The World" sees it, in the policy of "too proud to fight."

As to the appropriateness of the parallel between the soldier of Trenton, Valley Forge and Yorktown and the author of the recently familiar notes expressing American policy at home and abroad, The Tribune will leave this question to history to decide. What interests it at the moment is the reference to itself and criticism of Mr. Wilson as the outgrowth of "a mud-battery." The Tribune is interested in this charge because it suggests that "The World" has at last concluded that its own record in the matter of mud is so completely forgotten that it can safely charge other newspapers with pursuing the course which long gave it the sole distinction it enjoyed in American journalism.

But The Tribune believes that in this "History of the United States" the following account of "The World's" part in the effort to defeat Abraham Lincoln in 1864 is taken:

The desperate character of the canvass for McClellan led "The New York World," the ablest and most influential Democratic journal of the country, into an unworthy line of argument. Not content with the general charges of "ignorance, incompetency and corruption of Mr. Lincoln's administration," it cast imputations on the personal honesty of the President. It asked these questions: "Mr. Lincoln, has he or has he not an interest in the profits of public contracts?" "Is Mr. Lincoln honest?" and gave these answers: "That Lincoln has succumbed to the opportunities and temptations of his present place is capable of the easiest proof," and "This claim of honesty will not bear examination." Again it made this assertion: "Honest Abe has few honest men to defend his honesty."

As to our neighbor the "Staats-Zeitung," and German-Americans generally, we hold no brief for them, but we fancy that it must come with surprise to them to be described as "Copperheads" by that newspaper which, in the Civil War, was the recognized and proclaimed organ of "Copperheadism," and in the dark days that followed the early failures of Grant in the advance to Richmond was actually suspended by the government for publishing a false and harmful rumor intended to weaken the cause of the North and contribute to the aid and comfort of the South.

Our neighbor "The World" affects to treat with indignation and bitterness those German-Americans who are now in rebellion against the United States or at work conspiring against its safety. But in the days of the draft riot, when this city was in rebellion against the necessary compulsion to fill the gaps in the lines at the front, it was "The World" which frankly and openly attacked the United States government for its course in ordering and enforcing the draft. In the crisis of that draft riot the "Copperhead" mob marched to the Tribune Building and destroyed the machinery, but "The World" was not molested.

The Tribune does not quarrel with "The World" because in 1915, as in 1864, it advocates peace at any price and supports a Democrat on a platform of "too proud to fight." It recognizes the right of "The World" to adhere to the policy it has always pursued without regard to any question save that of parochial Democratic politics. It realizes that a newspaper which attacked Abraham Lincoln because he defended national honor and safety would naturally support Woodrow Wilson in sacrificing both.

But it ventures to suggest that "The World" should never permit any excess of egotism to lead it to betray it into the use of certain terms. Of these are mud-battery and "Copperhead."

Ellis Island, a Privilege.

Undoubtedly New York's most striking and expressive possession is its sky line, that storm of pitted masonry which outlines itself against the clouds like a fairy city of Maxfield Parrish's designing, now floating in a steel blue atmosphere, now rising phantasm-like from the mists, and again studded against the dusk with a myriad pin points of light. It is the one thing in New York which can be got nowhere else; the world contains no duplicate.

But, unfortunately for New Yorkers, it is something which cannot be enjoyed within the city itself. One must withdraw in a spirit of detachment to Brooklyn or Jersey City or to one of the islands of the bay to see it in its true perspective and as a whole. Ellis Island affords one of the best points of vantage, and very appropriately, as the gateway to the land of immigrant dreams. There it is the one tre-

mendous fact focussing attention, as solid as Pike's Peak, as beautiful as a mirage.

"Ah, I could gaze at the buildings for hours!" exclaims Professor Volpi, of Florence. "They are marvellous, wonderful! To appreciate them one should spend a week in the harbor."

Professor Volpi knows whereof he speaks, but it is not every voyager to these shores who has either the temperament or the grace to refer thus delicately to his detention. An annoyance, an indignity, an outrage? Hardly. A privilege, rather, which should be accorded every New Yorker for the good of his soul.

And we are just enthusiastic enough to see no malice in the suggestion.

A Respite from Sewage.

Again the city seems to be saved—temporarily, at least—from the prospect of drinking sewage from state institutions. Following the argument of Corporation Counsel Hardy's application for an injunction to prevent the emptying of sewage from the Mohansic State Hospital and the New York Training School for Boys into Mohansic Lake, it was announced that the Attorney General had signed a stipulation that no action toward the building of the sewage disposal plant would be taken until the Legislature meets. Then there will be presented a proposal to pipe the sewage effluent across country to the Hudson near Peekskill.

Though this would unquestionably be better than the direct discharge of the effluent into Mohansic Lake, one of the feeders of the city's water supply, there have been raised serious objections even to the course now under consideration by the state officers. It is argued that leaks might occur in the several miles of pipe line from the institutions across to the Hudson which might be almost, if not quite, as dangerous as the discharging of the sewage into Mohansic Lake, since they would be undetected for a considerable period. Of the relative danger of this procedure, compared with the emptying of sewage into Mohansic Lake, the legislators will have to be the judges. One thing is certain—this great city is entitled to every possible protection to the health and safety of its inhabitants. Any possibility of an epidemic of disease which menaces them menaces also the millions of persons to whom they might transmit such disease. It is not just, it is not fair, to the city, which contains more than half the population of the state and which pays far more than half the taxes of the state, that there should ever be such a menace. If piping the sewage to the Hudson can be proved to be a safe measure, it will be acceptable. If not, the Legislature will have to consider this city's demand that the proposed new institutions be built somewhere else within the district which supplies this city's drinking water. New York has no desire to drink sewage, even in minutest quantity.

Sniping.

All big game hunters should be interested in the sniping record of a Queensland cavalryman named Sing (there is music in the chronicle of his deeds!), who by September 1 had shot ninety-one turkeys. Sing had won prizes for marksmanship both at Brisbane and at Sydney before the open season for turkeys lured him to Galipoli. And now "day after day and night after night he settles down comfortably in some pet position and waits with inexhaustible patience for his chance."

There is really no sport like it in all the world, as the feudists of the Southern Appalachians have long known. Man is not only the most dangerous of game when roused, but the most cunning. And he is a brave hunter who would pit himself against him; and he must be a brainy one if he would get him first.

Sing "sits for hours with a telescope as an aid, watching the Turkish tracks over the hill or the lengths of the Turkish trenches, until sooner or later a Turk shows himself. If the Turk is wary and quickly bobs up and then down again Sing does not fire. He proceeds on the principle that, emboldened by fancied security, the Turk will gradually risk first his head, then his shoulders, and finally the upper half of his body. At this stage Sing's rifle cracks and the Turk is seen to fall. A notch is made by Sing in a stick which he keeps by way of a record."

Sing, we fear, likes to feel that he has killed his man, which introduces into the sport an unnecessary element of destructive fervor. On the West front, on the other hand, the opposing sportsmen seem quite content merely with disabling their quarry. Owen Johnson has written of instances there when Frenchmen have deposited their little tins of food on the trench's brink as a taunt to the Germans, who in their turn have watched these shining marks with infinite patience, knowing full well that at supper time their possessors would reach up to reclaim them. And when they did the boche rifles barked and bullets sped through tins and hostile hands impartially.

Your perfect sniper is the watchfullest waiter there is.

"The Hands of God."

It was in this manner that the father of English surgery spoke of his trade: "He that shall duly consider the deplorable misery of mankind, and how much it wanteth relief in such a multitude of instances, must needs acknowledge us to be what Antiquity hath long since called us, viz. *The Hands of God*. Indeed the ancient Grecians in the days of Ignorance did not stick to testify their reverence of the Eminent men of the Profession, by referring them into the number of the Gods which they worshipped. Nor have the latter times, though wiser than to rise to such extravagance, been backward in expressing their esteem of us; which notwithstanding they have guided with much more discretion and usefulness."

In attempting to determine the precise

measure of authority that may safely be granted to a profession so much concerned in relieving the misery of mankind it is evident that we must be governed in the main by considerations of discretion and usefulness. In the case of the baby that was allowed to die in Chicago the other day the coroner's jury showed more regard for such considerations than certain enthusiasts who, without measure or judgment, and even without knowledge of the particular circumstances, have incontinently execrated or applauded the surgeon who has been so busy of late providing the papers with photographs of himself in various postures.

It is altogether reasonable that a surgeon should not be obliged to perform an operation against his conscience and judgment, but this obvious truth must not blind us to the possibility of error as it seems to have blinded some of the noisy criers of persecution in this case. Many men would die prematurely if their fate were to be determined entirely by one doctor's speculations on probability.

That the better sort have no delusions on this head is probably true, and most doctors would doubtless agree with the jury "that the physician's highest duty is to relieve suffering and to prolong life." But the commonplace was perhaps worth reiterating in respect of a tendency in some quarters to assume an undue power over life and death, as if in these things the surgeon were something more than the Hand of God.

Excesses of Censorship.

If sober people in England were not greatly concerned at the temporary suspension of so violent and injudicious a journal as "The Globe," of London, many of them regarded the action of the government with misgivings which will not be dispelled by the clemency graciously extended in the meantime to the truculent editor. For the circumstances were such as to justify grave fears for the freedom of the press generally, nor were these fears satisfactorily disposed of when the matter was debated in the House of Commons.

The question that occurs even to those who are most inclined to regard the government with indulgence is this: if such a thing can be done so easily in the case of "The Globe," what is to prevent a repetition of the process whenever any editor has the misfortune to displease the government? The question is natural, for the policy of the government has never been made clear in this matter. "The Globe" did indeed defy the Press Bureau, but that is not generally regarded as a satisfactory pretext for suppressing it by executive act without any appeal whatever to the courts.

The case seems to be nearly similar to the case of the "Eclair," of Paris, which was suppressed about a month ago after an attack upon the government. This act was denounced by M. Berenger as "not merely a material damage, most arbitrarily inflicted, but a moral violence wholly unworthy of the regular régime of our Western democracies." The law regarding censorship, so far as the public knows, confers no right on those in authority to seize newspapers without legal trial. In practice, however, the censor seems to have his own way. Thus a paper of Orleans had some proof-sheets returned long since with a marginal note to the effect that "attacks against the government and the Parliament are forbidden, according to ministerial instructions." No such instructions had ever hitherto been communicated to newspapers.

Obviously a censorship which is turned to account by the government to suppress criticism would be a very real danger, and in England quite as much as in France, especially to-day, when the House of Commons, to a considerable degree, voluntarily refrains from criticism.

Mr. Ford has announced a prospective absence in Europe. War has its compensations.

The New Centre of the Fur Trade.

(From the Springfield Republican.)

Among other effects of the European War is the shifting of the world's fur market from London to St. Louis. The United States government recently sold nearly \$500,000 worth of furs in the Missouri city, and Russia and other foreign countries are shipping large quantities of furs to St. Louis for sale. The United States got into the fur business by the requirement of the Pribilof islands when it bought Alaska from Russia.

But where do the fox skins come in? The two larger islands of the Pribilof group have supported exceptionally large packs of foxes, the animals living in spring and summer on the eggs of countless birds that nest there and on the birds themselves, and in winter on the remains of the seals slaughtered for their skins. The fox industry became in this way largely dependent on sealing, and it has suffered since the close season was proclaimed. Nevertheless, the returns from the recent sale of fox skins equalled interest on \$1,000,000, and when sealing is resumed it is believed that the size of the government fox pack can be materially increased.

Spain Honors Cervera.

(From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.)

The other day Cervera's remains were reburied in the Pantheon at Madrid, under a monument with this inscription: "Here rest, in this sacred spot, the mortal remains of Vice-Admiral Cervera, a gallant sailor, a man of honor, faithful, upright, a model of abnegation, courtesy, and all the Christian virtues." Americans, who never at any time failed to see the glory of Cervera's forlorn hope charge at Santiago, and who have never failed in paying due honor to the living man, and the dead man's memory, feel a satisfaction at this belated tribute, from his own country, to one who wrote a glorious page in its history in making a hopeless sacrifice of the disastrous end still justified the heroic means. It can now be said that had Cervera failed in doing that very thing for which he was once the most condemned in Spain, Spanish honor would not rest in Spain's Pantheon.

WEST POINTERS

They Have an Advantage in Taking Up an Army Career.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: With reference to Mr. J. B. W. Gardiner's article on West Pointers and his view of the causes for the shortage of officers, I would say that the graduate of West Point has far better chances for becoming an officer than either the enlisted man or the civilian. If Mr. Gardiner will look up this matter he will find that at the present time and for the past year or two neither the enlisted man nor the civilian has had an opportunity to compete for a commission in the regular army. He will also find that we now have something over two hundred, I believe, second lieutenants, graduates of the Military Academy, on the list of extra officers who have not filled vacancies, but who will do so just as soon as vacancies occur, and until these extra officers are disposed of by vacancies no enlisted man or civilian can be appointed according to law.

Now, take the question of the enlisted man and the civilian: An enlisted man must have practically a college education in order to pass his examination for a commission, which means four years' study at his own expense, besides two years of his valuable time which he puts in the army at fifteen dollars a month, and he may have to wait six years before sufficient vacancies in the army enable him to compete for a commission, and if he waits that long, nine times out of ten he has passed the age limit—twenty-seven years—to qualify. Further, the enlisted man spends two years of his time specializing in one particular military subject, infantry, cavalry, or artillery, under experts or specialists in this subject. Is he not more qualified to command troops of that branch than a cadet who has covered four years, of probably one hour a day, in that branch? Also, the cadet gets \$50 per month for his time at the academy.

The civilian is probably less qualified than either of the above, but when you consider that he is also required to pass an examination which would require graduation from a college or university, and be not over twenty-seven years of age, he will prove pretty material for the making of an officer. However, education is a very small part of the real qualifications of an officer; ability, training, character and experience are more beneficial than education. The man who has commanded troops or has had experience in the handling of men in large numbers and has the ability and character to lead men is, in my opinion, far superior to the graduate of any educational institution.

In conclusion, the real reason for not having sufficient officers for our army in event of war is in the failure of Congress to provide institutions similar to West Point all over the country and provide for the appointment of the graduates as officers. You would get more officers out of the evening high schools of New York City than you would out of West Point if you guaranteed them half the pay and allowance of officers of the army upon graduation; the only educational requirement being graduation from high school.

FRANK A. CLARKE.

Brooklyn, Nov. 18, 1915.

Courtesy in the Subway.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: When I first came to New York, several years ago, from a New England town (which I shall call B—), to obviate the possibility of giving rise to side discussions, I followed my established habit of giving up my seat to a woman whenever I saw one standing. I soon abandoned this courteous attitude, and now for years I have given up my seat only to elderly women or to women with children in arms. This was for the reason that I found that the women one favors in the New York subway show, in nine cases out of ten, no appreciation of the polite tendering of a seat by a man.

My son, fifteen years old, has been at school in New England, and has just come to New York to enter a high school here. I confess I felt some qualms of conscience when he asked me, in rather a surprised tone, if people in New York did not usually give up their seats to ladies. I told him that he might do as he thought best, that I was glad to see that he was habituated to giving consideration to women and offering them every courtesy, and that I hoped that those whom he might favor would show him their appreciation by a pleasant smile or a word of thanks.

This morning I said to myself that I must be mistaken. I had a seat in a crowded subway car and saw a woman standing near me. I saluted her by raising my hat and said, "Good morning, madam." And she took it. Did she thank me? She did not. Not one line of her face indicated appreciation of my courtesy, and she bounced into my seat with the air of one who had finally received her due. She did not even look at me.

It happens that this person left the car after two or three stations, and I regained my seat. I saw another woman just coming in the door. I thought I would give them one more opportunity to redeem themselves. I arose, offered her my seat, and she sank into it with an air of satisfaction. Although she looked at me straight in the face, yet she did not say a word. Her feeling was evidently different from the other woman's, but her complete lack of desire to acknowledge courteously a little politeness shown her by an entire stranger was identical.

Shall I offer my seat to the sex promiscuously in future? I shall not. Shall I teach my son to give up his seat to the sex? Yes, because he is adolescent and impressionable, and might get a viewpoint that I should not wish him to have.

VAN.

New York, Nov. 22, 1915.

An Appeal from Mothers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: We, the members of the Mothers' Club of the Henry Street Settlement, who know so well from our own experience the anxiety and the grief that come to the families of the working people, are shocked because of the loss of life in the fire at Williamsburg.

Like many other accidents to working people, it seems to us that the sacrifice of human life was needless, because it was due to lack of proper enforcement of laws passed to safeguard the lives of working men and women and children.

We feel that we must give public expression at this time to our feelings against this disregard for the safety of the working people. We think that there should be a "protection" in the small shops as well as in the large factories. The loss of an individual life is as great a loss to the family as the larger number is to the community.

We call upon mothers to unite to protest against such careless methods employed in safeguarding our beloved ones. We feel that our husbands, children, sisters and brothers are sacrificed through criminal negligence.

We entreat those responsible, and the public, whose demand will bring about the enforcement of laws, that our workers may not again be sacrificed.

M. M. TAYLOR (For the Club).

New York, Nov. 17, 1915.

MARS.



BAD FACTORY CONDITIONS LEGALIZED

An Engineer's Analysis of Law's Requirements in the Case of the Williamsburg Factory Which Burned—How Over-occupancy Was Permitted, Resulting in Disaster.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: While the authorities are hunting for some underling to blame for the loss of life at the Williamsburg factory fire, it may be instructive to look for fundamentals and see whether the laws limiting the number of people permitted to work in the factory and insuring safety to their lives, if enforced, would have tended to prevent what happened.

Article 5, Section 79-e, of the labor law, which covers the requirements, says specifically, "The number of persons who may occupy any factory building or portion thereof above the ground floor shall be limited to such a number as can safely escape from such a building by means of the exits provided in the building."

The exits provided in the building were two stairways, three feet wide, at a distance from each other accessible from each floor. It has been found that the average person requires twenty-two inches width of passage-way in which to move, and the recent law was so drafted affecting new buildings, but as old buildings were constructed with passageways on an eighteen inch unit basis, instead of limiting the number of people to the actual capacity of the passageways the exigencies of the case were considered in favor of the building owner, and the average person was considered to be only eighteen inches wide. In this building the stairs, being thirty-six inches wide, were plenty wide enough for one person and too narrow for two to go down abreast. The actual capacity of such a stairway would be ten persons per floor. But instead of this number the law permitted three times that number in this building, or a double file of thirty on each stairway, or sixty in all.

It would have cost something like \$2,000 to fireproof the two stairways, as ordered by the Department of Labor. It would have cost possibly \$500 to install a fire alarm system, as ordered by the Fire Department. A practical fire drill, although demanded, would have been impossible of development on account of the lack of exit facilities. If one could have been installed it would have cost more money to develop and maintain and for the reason stated would have failed in the emergency. So that by an expenditure of more than \$2,500, the owner could, under the enforcement of the orders issued, have secured a legal occupancy of a floor of sixty people, and if all had been in the building when the fire occurred they could not possibly have escaped from it.

But the probability is that there were demands on the part of tenants for a greater occupancy than sixty a floor. In fact, the evidence given before the Coroner shows that there were at least seventy people on the top floor at the time of the fire, and that on some of the other floors the occupancy was even greater at times, so that there would be very little inducement for a factory owner to spend \$2,500 in order to obtain so small a floor occupancy as sixty.

Under these circumstances what was the building owner to do to meet the demands of tenants? The law states that he may construct additional stairways or fire escapes for the purpose, but if he should construct an additional stairway the expense would run up to \$2,500 or more, and he would get but thirty people additional a floor, so that the expense would be out of proportion to the increased occupancy secured, and so far as safety is concerned the percentage of chance of escape would not be increased; and if he should construct a fire escape he all know from long experience that fire escape is a misnomer, and it should be entitled a "human griddle."

But the law as amended last winter offers still another opportunity for the building owner to increase the occupancy of each floor. It says that if a sprinkler system is installed, the occupancy may be increased one hundred per cent. The Fire Prevention Bureau, it seems, actually ordered a sprinkler system installed in this building, but withdrew the requirement subsequently, as they felt that the fireproofing of the stairs would give adequate safety. But what would the sprinkler system have accomplished and

what would it have cost? It would have allowed 120 people to occupy each floor, and it could have been introduced into this building at an expense in the neighborhood of \$4,500. Of course the permission granted by this amendment to the law is a still further violation of the spirit of the statute which says that the number allowed to occupy a building or portion of it shall be limited to the number that can safely escape by the means of exit provided, and if the means of exit already provided allowed only a sixty a floor, surely the installation of a sprinkler system (not being an exit facility) should not provide an increase in the occupancy, and, as far as safety is concerned, a sprinkler system, being automatic in its action, does not always work. There are valves, tanks, pumps and other parts which may get out of order. There are concerns which make a living inspecting and supervising sprinkler systems, and unless a sprinkler system is supervised it is uncertain of action. But the law does not require this supervision; therefore, when a fire comes there may be no water there to put it out, and it is evident what will happen to the people.

If such a supervision is desired it would cost more money—\$500 a year for a building like this. But if the sprinkler system does work the fire must set it off, and it must gain headway to set it off, and this takes time. Meanwhile, people do not sit around waiting, but as soon as the fire starts they go, and as many people as can crowd into a stairway on each floor do so, and in this instance the stairway would accommodate only ten a floor, and the other 110 would have to remain on the floor to await such casualty as would confront them.

But the law says that there is still another way whereby the building owner can increase the occupancy and at the same time obtain a greater amount of safety than would be offered by any other means. This is by erecting a fire wall through his building, practically bisecting it. This fire wall must have doors on each floor, covered by fireproof doors. In case a fire should occur on one side of this wall all the people have to do to escape from it is to walk through the doorways in the wall (which would not take more than a minute), close the fireproof doors after them, and then they find themselves in what is practically a separate building in which there is no fire and leisure to descend to the ground by the existing exit facilities.

A fire wall in this building would cost not to exceed \$800 a floor, or, say, \$5,000 all told, and in addition a fire alarm system would have to be installed, costing, say, \$500. The law now requires that the stairways on both sides of this fire wall should be fireproofed and that a fire drill should be installed. Both of these requirements are unnecessary and the Industrial Board has omitted them under the recent variations and amendments. With these omissions, there is therefore a greater probability that the building owner would be willing to spend \$5,500 to secure a floor occupancy of nearly 500, with the assurance in addition that abundant safety would be secured for everybody in the building, than to spend \$7,000 for a floor occupancy of only 120, with no assurance of safety for anybody.

These facts have been known since the present laws were put on the statute books. Under them conditions have not been improved; in fact, the bad conditions existing prior to the time the Triangle fire are now legalized. The alternative offered to the occupants of our factories of "burning to death or jumping to death" is still extended.

If we are seeking where to place responsibility it must be divided between five bodies, the one which drafted the laws, the one which enacted them, the two which were established to enforce them and the one entrusted with the duty of seeing that they were maintained on the statute books and that the bodies created to enforce them performed their functions. This fire demonstrates the way a democracy works and give them the necessary equipment to perform their functions effectively we must expect inefficiency and suffer the consequences.

H. F. J. PORTER.

New York, Nov. 18, 1915.

CRUELITIES IN MACEDONIA

Are Not Committed by Bulgarians Against Fellow Bulgars.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Some of the papers have published statements, emanating evidently from Serbian or Greek sources, attributing cruelties to the Bulgarian forces operating in Macedonia, especially about Pripel and Monastir. One who knows nothing about the population of Macedonia will be naturally taken in by these statements. To refute them it is sufficient to state that there is no Serb population either in or about Monastir. The majority of the population there, as in the district of Pripel, is Bulgarian, and not only are they unlikely to flee before the Bulgarian forces but will welcome them with open arms as their saviors and liberators from the Serbian oppression.

The Bulgarian forces that are operating in Macedonia consist mostly of Macedonian volunteers, who, to the number of 50,000, it is reported, have enlisted in the Bulgarian army. The women and girls said to be fleeing from these volunteers are, in many cases, wives, daughters and sisters of these men who are fighting against the Serbians in defence of their homes and country. It is not likely that they will suffer any harm at the hands of the invaders. The majority of the Macedonians being Bulgars, and in hearty sympathy with Bulgaria, all stories about the Bulgarian troops practising any cruelties and outrages upon them are to be received with a great deal of salt.

Those interested in the above facts, upon request to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C., will receive one of the best and most worthy reports ever compiled, made after similar reports were mandaciously spread by Serbian and Greek sources in the Second Balkan War.

MACEDONIAN.

New York, Nov. 20, 1915.

Blue Cross and Purple Cross.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Although this reply, due Lucy Elphinstone Maitland, honorable secretary of the Blue Cross Fund, is belated, I crave her pardon and the courtesy of your columns, inasmuch as I've been delayed trying to find their first appeal for funds (October 25); which I mistakenly supplemented with advice as to an American agency. As I am able to recall, this first appeal contained no intimation that there existed an American representative, and seemed to infer that only one agency was working for the relief of horses sick and injured in the European war zone. This misled me; having an eye for color but no ear for color I blundered. After all, it is not the "Blue" Cross; it is the "Purple" Cross of which Mrs. Clinton Pinckney Farrell is the honorable secretary of the American division, at 1 Madison Avenue. The statement made by Mrs. Maitland in her last letter, November 4, to The Tribune, that the Blue Cross Fund is the only organized society recognized by the French government, I am pleased to correct, and explain that the Purple Cross Service is officially authorized by the French Minister of War, A. Millerand, and offered by him, over his signature, every facility to work in conjunction with the army authorities. The Purple Cross for sick and injured horses has hospitals at Vesoul, Foulain (near Chaumont) and Bordeaux. Its president is the Earl of Buchan, London. One director of the service in France is Lieutenant Colonel T. A. Hill, 8 Place Edouard VII, Paris. Another is Major General H. Jardine Hallows, same address. My "pleasure" in correcting the above mistake arises from the recently acquired knowledge that there exists in America more than one effort to ameliorate the unmerited sufferings of horses in war. To quote M. Millerand: "Horses which have already rendered service . . . re-constructing the living material which represents one of the vital forces of the armies."

B. E. STORRS.

New York, Nov. 14, 1915.